July 16. 2004

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates - in many cases, dramatically higher rates - for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state - let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

Sincerely.

CCS:

Keith Wang, Unginer Commissioner Kathleen O. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Comps Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Senator Allen Senator Warner

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates - in many cases, dramatically higher rates - for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state - let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

MY

Sincerely,

ccs:

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Cy Frank

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein Senator Kerny Senator Kennedy

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Poweil:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates — in many cases, dramatically higher rates — for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state — let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

Sincerely.

ccs: Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates — in many cases, dramatically higher rates — for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state — let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

Sincerely.

ccs:

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Senator lennedy

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates — in many cases, dramatically higher rates — for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state -- let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

Sincerely

ccs: Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates — in many cases, dramatically higher rates — for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state — let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

Sincerely,

cos: Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Senator Kerry Senator Kennedy

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Copps, Abernathy, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am writing to ask that the FCC not impose new hidden charges and fees on prepaid calling card services.

Minorities, lower-income families, senior citizens, immigrants, college students and military families rely upon calling card services for a variety of needs. Many of these consumers do not have the credit, bank accounts, or surplus cash to pay a large deposit for local telephone service. For these consumers, a prepaid card may be the only option they have to stay connected - to make phone calls to look for a job, for affordable housing, make a doctor's appointment, or stay in touch with family and friends. These cards offer convenience and predictable costs.

In economically disadvantaged areas, consumers literally risk being disconnected if the prices of these cards increase. Prepaid calling cards are indispensable for these and other consumer groups because they are an affordable alternative to regular and wireless telephone services.

But such price hikes are precisely what the FCC will do if it inflicts new "in-state" access charges and other fees on pre-paid cards. The fees would funnel directly to large local telephone companies while the burden would fall squarely upon those consumers that can least afford to bear it. Adding access charges and fees will substantially increase the cost of providing pre-paid cards at affordable prices, jeopardizing the savings provided by these cards.

Please stop any effort to raise the costs of pre-paid calling cards on consumers by deciding that these services are not subject to exorbitant new access charges and other fees.

Massachusette

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Copps, Abernathy, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am writing to ask that the FCC not impose new hidden charges and fees on prepaid calling card services.

Minorities, lower-income families, senior citizens, immigrants, college students and military families rely upon calling card services for a variety of needs. Many of these consumers do not have the credit, bank accounts, or surplus cash to pay a large deposit for local telephone service. For these consumers, a prepaid card may be the only option they have to stay connected – to make phone calls to look for a job, for affordable housing, make a doctor's appointment, or stay in touch with family and friends. These cards offer convenience and predictable costs.

In economically disadvantaged areas, consumers literally risk being disconnected if the prices of these cards increase. Prepaid calling cards are indispensable for these and other consumer groups because they are an affordable alternative to regular and wireless telephone services.

But such price hikes are precisely what the FCC will do if it inflicts new "in-state" access charges and other fees on pre-paid cards. The fees would funnel directly to large local telephone companies while the burden would fall squarely upon those consumers that can least afford to bear it. Adding access charges and fees will substantially increase the cost of providing pre-paid cards at affordable prices, jeopardizing the savings provided by these cards.

Please stop any effort to raise the costs of pre-paid calling cards on consumers by deciding that these services are not subject to exorbitant new access charges and other fees.

Sincerely,

ccs:

Senator Corzue Senator Cautenberg

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Sincerely,

CCS:

Senator Corzue Senator, Minda Ohu Cautenberg Ravidalpy, N. 1. 07869

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Sincerely,

Ungine L. ng OCA- New Gersey

ccs:

Senator Corzine Senator Lautenberg

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Sincerely,

ccs:

Senator Corzine Senator Lautenberg W. J.

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Jean Chin, MA.

ccs: Senat

Senator Kern

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Sincerely, Chin, MA

ccs:

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates - in many cases, dramatically higher rates - for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state -- let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

ccs: Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dat Ching. Ma.

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein Senator Kennedy Senator Kerry

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Sincerely,

MASS.

ccs:

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all bave.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Man hi State of MASSACAUSETS

ccs:

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Copps, Abernathy, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am writing to ask that the FCC not impose new hidden charges and fees on prepaid calling card services.

Minorities, lower-income families, senior citizens, immigrants, college students and military families rely upon calling card services for a variety of needs. Many of these consumers do not have the credit, bank accounts, or surplus cash to pay a large deposit for local telephone service. For these consumers, a prepaid card may be the only option they have to stay connected - to make phone calls to look for a job, for affordable housing, make a doctor's appointment, or stay in touch with family and friends. These cards offer convenience and predictable costs.

In economically disadvantaged areas, consumers literally risk being disconnected if the prices of these cards increase. Prepaid calling cards are indispensable for these and other consumer groups because they are an affordable alternative to regular and wireless telephone services.

But such price hikes are precisely what the FCC will do if it inflicts new "in-state" access charges and other fees on pre-paid cards. The fees would funnel directly to large local telephone companies while the burden would fall squarely upon those consumers that can least afford to bear it. Adding access charges and fees will substantially increase the cost of providing pre-paid cards at affordable prices, jeopardizing the savings provided by these cards.

Please stop any effort to raise the costs of pre-paid calling cards on consumers by deciding that these services are not subject to exorbitant new access charges and other fees.

Sincerely,

Shever there Boston, MA

ccs:

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Copps, Abernathy, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am writing to ask that the FCC not impose new hidden charges and fees on prepaid calling card services.

Minorities, lower-income families, senior citizens, immigrants, college students and military families rely upon calling card services for a variety of needs. Many of these consumers do not have the credit, bank accounts, or surplus cash to pay a large deposit for local telephone service. For these consumers, a prepaid card may be the only option they have to stay connected - to make phone calls to look for a job, for affordable housing, make a doctor's appointment, or stay in touch with family and friends. These cards offer convenience and predictable costs.

In economically disadvantaged areas, consumers literally risk being disconnected if the prices of these cards increase. Prepaid calling cards are indispensable for these and other consumer groups because they are an affordable alternative to regular and wireless telephone services.

But such price hikes are precisely what the FCC will do if it inflicts new "in-state" access charges and other fees on pre-paid cards. The fees would funnel directly to large local telephone companies while the burden would fall squarely upon those consumers that can least afford to bear it. Adding access charges and fees will substantially increase the cost of providing pre-paid cards at affordable prices, jeopardizing the savings provided by these cards.

Please stop any effort to raise the costs of pre-paid calling cards on consumers by deciding that these services are not subject to exorbitant new access charges and other fees.

Senator Kennedy Boston, MA

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Copps, Abernathy, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am writing to ask that the FCC not impose new hidden charges and fees on prepaid calling card services.

Minorities, lower-income families, senior citizens, immigrants, college students and military families rely upon calling card services for a variety of needs. Many of these consumers do not have the credit, bank accounts, or surplus cash to pay a large deposit for local telephone service. For these consumers, a prepaid card may be the only option they have to stay connected - to make phone calls to look for a job, for affordable housing, make a doctor's appointment, or stay in touch with family and friends. These cards offer convenience and predictable costs.

In economically disadvantaged areas, consumers literally risk being disconnected if the prices of these cards increase. Prepaid calling cards are indispensable for these and other consumer groups because they are an affordable alternative to regular and wireless telephone services.

But such price hikes are precisely what the FCC will do if it inflicts new "in-state" access charges and other fees on pre-paid cards. The fees would funnel directly to large local telephone companies while the burden would fall squarely upon those consumers that can least afford to bear it. Adding access charges and fees will substantially increase the cost of providing pre-paid cards at affordable prices, jeopardizing the savings provided by these cards.

Please stop any effort to raise the costs of pre-paid calling cards on consumers by deciding that these services are not subject to exorbitant new access charges and other fees.

Sincerely.

Holman Forah - MA

ccs:

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates — in many cases, dramatically higher rates — for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state — let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

Angel Can

Sincerely,

ccs: Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Senator Kerry
Senator Kerry

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to. low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure

that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Sincerely,

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Copps. Abernathy, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am writing to ask that the FCC not impose new hidden charges and fees on prepaid calling card services.

Minorities, lower-income families, senior citizens, immigrants, college students and military families rely upon calling card services for a variety of needs. Many of these consumers do not have the credit, bank accounts, or surplus cash to pay a large deposit for local telephone service. For these consumers, a prepaid card may be the only option they have to stay connected - to make phone calls to look for a job, for affordable housing, make a doctor's appointment, or stay in touch with family and friends. These cards offer convenience and predictable costs.

In economically disadvantaged areas, consumers literally risk being disconnected if the prices of these cards increase. Prepaid calling cards are indispensable for these and other consumer groups because they are an affordable alternative to regular and wireless telephone services.

But such price hikes are precisely what the FCC will do if it inflicts new "in-state" access charges and other fees on pre-paid cards. The fees would funnel directly to large local telephone companies while the burden would fall squarely upon those consumers that can least afford to bear it. Adding access charges and fees will substantially increase the cost of providing pre-paid cards at affordable prices, jeopardizing the savings provided by these cards.

Please stop any effort to raise the costs of pre-paid calling cards on consumers by deciding that these services are not subject to exorbitant new access charges and other fees.

Sincerely,

CCS:

Senator McKelfi Senator Sarkene

Therother Gray
Maryland
OCA-NOVA Chapter

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

The FCC should not impose new access charges and fees upon prepaid calling cards. If you move to increase the cost of these cards, you will simply drive up the cost for minority or disadvantaged individuals to stay in touch in their communities.

Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, are among the fastest adopters of prepaid cards. Ten percent of Asian-American households have used them, and this number is growing. Moreover, the affordability of pre-paid cards is of the utmost importance to low- and fixed-income consumers, since they offer an easy, economical way to stay in touch with friends and relatives across the country.

With other goods like gas and milk rising these days, we should not now be faced with rising telephone costs as well. In particular, many low-income households who are on fixed incomes depend upon prepaid service because they cannot meet the credit rating or hefty deposit requirements that local phone companies insist upon before getting a phone. With prepaid cards, consumers can make calls from payphones or the telephones of family members and neighbors. They can use these cards to stay "connected" as they look for jobs, hunt for housing, or schedule many of the other daily appointments that we all have.

I simply find it unimaginable that the FCC would impose new charges and fees on these cards. Some of the nation's largest local telephone companies would be the biggest recipients of such charges. The FCC should stand up for consumers and make sure that these charges will not apply to prepaid calling cards.

Sincerely,

MD USA

ccs:

Senator Mukuldii Senator

RE: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Copps, Abernathy, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am writing to ask that the FCC not impose new hidden charges and fees on prepaid calling card services.

Minorities, lower-income families, senior citizens, immigrants, college students and military families rely upon calling card services for a variety of needs. Many of these consumers do not have the credit, bank accounts, or surplus cash to pay a large deposit for local telephone service. For these consumers, a prepaid card may be the only option they have to stay connected – to make phone calls to look for a job, for affordable housing, make a doctor's appointment, or stay in touch with family and friends. These cards offer convenience and predictable costs.

In economically disadvantaged areas, consumers literally risk being disconnected if the prices of these cards increase. Prepaid calling cards are indispensable for these and other consumer groups because they are an affordable alternative to regular and wireless telephone services.

But such price hikes are precisely what the FCC will do if it inflicts new "in-state" access charges and other fees on pre-paid cards. The fees would funnel directly to large local telephone companies while the burden would fall squarely upon those consumers that can least afford to bear it. Adding access charges and fees will substantially increase the cost of providing pre-paid cards at affordable prices, jeopardizing the savings provided by these cards.

Please stop any effort to raise the costs of pre-paid calling cards on consumers by deciding that these services are not subject to exorbitant new access charges and other fees.

Sincerely,

Chull (Cy OCA, NY)

Senator Schumer Senator Clinton

ccs:

Chairman Michael K. Powell Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 03-133

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of groups and individuals opposed to efforts by the local Bell telephone companies to circumvent current rules on calls placed with a pre-paid calling card. If they succeed, it will result in higher rates — in many cases, dramatically higher rates — for consumers who place the calls. As you approach your work on this docket, I implore you to keep the needs of consumers in mind rather than the pleadings of the four Bell companies.

The Bell companies want to target those calls in which a caller uses a pre-paid calling card and dials a toll-free number, along with his or her PIN. The caller, who may be in Virginia, for example, is connected to a "platform" in another state — let's say in Nebraska. From this "platform," he or she hears a message about a company, non-profit or person. The caller then dials the telephone number of someone in Virginia. Current rules, as well as common sense, state that this represents two calls, one from Virginia to Nebraska and one from Nebraska to Virginia. Both calls are subject to interstate access charges because there is a call to Nebraska and then a separate call to Virginia.

But the Bell companies want to treat this as a single in-state call so they can levy exorbitant instate access charges. Such fees have no relationship whatsoever to the Bell companies' actual costs, which are only a fraction of what they want to charge consumers.

Prices are already rising for gas, milk and other products. Consumers don't need higher prices for phone calls too, especially when these higher rates represent a blatant giveaway to four large corporations.

I am aware that the long distance companies and others that sell pre-paid calling cards have weighed in with the FCC in an effort to protect their customers' interests in this manner. It is now time for the FCC to weigh in on the side of consumers and show the Bell companies the door on this issue.

Sincerely

New York

ccs:

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Senator 5